

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

|                        |   |                      |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| ROBERT DARRELL THOMAS, | ) |                      |
|                        | ) |                      |
| Petitioner,            | ) |                      |
|                        | ) | Civil No. 05-0015-TC |
| v.                     | ) |                      |
|                        | ) | ORDER                |
| CHARLES DANIELS,       | ) |                      |
|                        | ) |                      |
| Respondent.            | ) |                      |
| _____                  | ) |                      |

Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Coffin filed Findings and Recommendation on October 17, 2005, in the above entitled case. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate judge's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.,

656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Petitioner has timely filed objections. I have, therefore, given de novo review of Magistrate Judge Coffin's rulings.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Coffin's Findings and Recommendation filed October 17, 2005, in its entirety. Petitioner's petition (#2) is denied. This proceeding is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 30<sup>th</sup> day of Nv., 2005.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE